

REMARKS

Claims 9 and 11-13 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

By this amendment, claims 9 and 10 have been amended. Claims 11, 12 and 13 have been cancelled. It is believed that changes to claims 9 and 10 now make them clear and definite.

Claims 1-4 and 6 were rejected under 35 USC" 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Slyke et al (US Patent 6,797,314) issued September 28, 2004; filed July 3, 2001) in view of Shi (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0016907 filed July 21, 2003). Claim 5 was rejected under 35 USC" 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Slyke et al (US Patent 6,797,314) issued September 28, 2004; filed July 3, 2001) in view of Shi (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0016907 filed July 21, 2003) and further in view of Okuyama et al (U.S. Patent 6,835,681; issued December 28, 2004; filed December 19, 2001). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 USC" 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Slyke et al (US Patent 6,797,314) issued September 28, 2004; filed July 3, 2001) in view of Shi (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0016907 filed July 21, 2003) and further in view of Staniforth et al (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0047810; priority date November 30, 2000). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 USC" 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Slyke et al (US Patent 6,797,314) issued September 28, 2004; filed July 3, 2001) in view of Shi (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0016907 filed July 21, 2003) and further in view of Beebe et al (U.S. Patent 6,543,928; issued April 8, 2003). Claims 9 an 10 were rejected under 35 USC" 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Slyke et al (US Patent 6,797,314) issued September 28, 2004; filed July 3, 2001) in view of Shi (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0016907 filed July 21, 2003) and further in view of Renfro (U.S. Patent 6,910,799; filed November 14, 2002).

VanSlyke et al was commonly assigned to the Eastman Kodak Company at the time it was filed and the present invention is also commonly assigned to the Eastman Kodak Company. Therefore, under 35 USC 103(c) VanSlyke et al should be withdrawn as a reference.

Shi was commonly assigned to the Eastman Kodak Company at the time it was filed and the present invention is also commonly assigned to the Eastman Kodak Company. Therefore, under 35 USC 103(c) Shi should be withdrawn as a reference.

Okuyama et al relates to a method of molding ceramic materials. As discussed in col. 4, ceramic materials are mixed with a solvent to form a homogeneous solution. The mixture is sintered to form a solid that is milled to obtain a powder. A binder is added to the powder and then the ceramic materials are molded using heat and pressure to form an article. Okuyama et al has nothing to do with powders of organic materials that include a dopant component and a host component. Moreover, there is no suggestion in Okuyama et al to form a pellet for thermal physical vaporization to form an organic layer on a substrate. There is no motivation in Okuyama et al for forming pellets for thermal vapor deposition and there is no suggestion of the present invention as set forth in independent claim 1. Furthermore, Applicants believe that Okuyama et al is not analogous art. In view of the foregoing, it is believed that claim 1 defines unobvious subject matter and should be allowable.

Staniforth et al teach a method of drying mixing powders with a high speed mixer. Staniforth et al relate to pharmaceutical compositions for pulmonary administration and also for making micro-particles in connection therewith. Applicants fail to see how this method of making pharmaceutical microparticles is in any way related with the claimed method set forth in claim 1 of making pellets formed of powdered organic materials. Accordingly, this reference should not stand in the way of the allowance of claim 1.

Beebe discloses a processing arrangement using a magnetically coupled agitator. Beebe has nothing to do with forming pellets nor does he use an inert atmosphere. There is no suggestion in Beebe for the arrangement set forth in claim 1 which compacts a homogeneous mixture of powdered organic materials to form a pellet. Applicants fail to see how Beebe could in any way be combined with Staniforth et al to disclose or suggest the present invention set forth in claim 1.

Renfro does disclose another mixer which is adapted to be used with a caulking compound. This reference as with Beebe and Staniforth et al should not stand in the way of the allowance of claim 1.

It is believed that these changes now make the claims clear and definite and, if there are any problems with these changes, Applicants' attorney would appreciate a telephone call.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed none of the references, taken singly or in combination, disclose the claimed invention. Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 22,363

Raymond L. Owens/das
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-477-4653
Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.